

# <sup>the</sup> American Teacher

*Democracy in Education; Education for Democracy.*

VOL. IV No. 4

NEW YORK, APRIL, 1915

50 CENTS A YEAR

## *The Blessings of Discipline*



Blessed are the Poor, for they shall be disciplined  
by the Misery of Poverty;

Blessed are the Meek, for they shall be disciplined  
by the Arrogance of their Neighbors;

Blessed are the Sick, for they shall be disciplined  
by the Whips of Suffering;

Blessed are the Stubborn, for they shall be broken  
as on a Wheel.

\* \* \*

Let the Gods discipline with Whips and Scorn and  
Remorse;

Let Teachers find Something Better to do.

## THE MORAL ASPECTS OF ADDING TO THE WORK OF TEACHERS\*

SARA H FAHEY  
P S 147, Brooklyn

THE MEMBERS of the teaching profession of the City of New York have grave reason to protest vigorously against the proposed plan to impress teachers into service in the vacation schools with or without pay. Such a measure should be opposed on moral, if on no other grounds, because, as I shall try to show, such an arrangement would militate most seriously against the moral welfare of teachers and pupils, not only in the regular day schools, but in the special or vacation schools as well.

Because of their belief that teaching is a profession with ever-developing standards, thousands of our colleagues are enrolled in colleges. They attend lectures at these places at the close of the afternoon session, on Saturdays, and during the summer vacation. They have been taking advantage of every opportunity open to them in these respects, to the end that they may make themselves more efficient workers.

Now they are asked to take an opposite view of the requirements for their profession. It is to be no longer a question of equipment for service, of power to inspire. It is to be reduced to a question of mere hours spent in the classroom, however unfitted is the person who spends them there.

Moreover, the teachers are called upon to give the time they need for revitalizing themselves to the richest city in the country to enable that city to do only its plain duty, namely, to educate its children. I say, its plain duty, for the education of the children is a work for which the city, the state, and the nation must be responsible if a democratic government is to be perpetuated.

All thinking people realize that the hope and strength of a country like ours, rests in its intelligent citizenship; they realize that the uncared-for boys and girls are the ones who are more than

likely to become a menace to the community; that proper education will do more than any other thing to abolish crime, and to lessen the dangerous army of the unemployed. If the work of education is thus all important, how can it be deemed a wise policy that would put a system of schools on such a shifting basis as that furnished by the involuntary service of teachers; or that would underrate, to such a degree, the work of the teacher and of the school during the school year. Furthermore, a democracy cannot afford to permit its public school business to be maintained by the involuntary contributions of its teachers whether those contributions take the form of labor or of money. The public schools must be given adequate support if their dignity is to be maintained.

But going back to this ill-advised suggestion, in its effect on the teacher. We know that the present demands upon the strength of the painstaking, conscientious teacher of our city are already far too great. Not that teaching in itself, that is, the relations of teachers to children, need ever be a complex problem; but, with overcrowded classrooms, often in poverty-stricken tenement sections, with no home background for the children's activities, with new problems of adjustment constantly coming up, in the high pressure under which our schools are being administered, the maximum endurance of even the strongest teachers is tested.

Then, too, is it morally wholesome for the teacher to feel that, however much they do for the welfare of the school, no real value is set upon it—that the hours given to delinquent pupils before and after the regular sessions; to the

\* Part of Report of the Committee on School Organization and Management at a meeting of the Teachers' League of New York City, December 19, 1914.

calls made upon parents; to the conferences of teachers; the time spent at home examining the work of the children, and in preparation for the lessons of the coming day—is it morally wholesome for her to feel that this time is, in no sense, estimated or valued by the Board of Education, the parents, or any other class of citizens?

Should we be obliged to reiterate again and again to an intelligent community, that one hundred ninety-five days from nine to three o'clock does not constitute the teacher's hours of labor? Even though we know how impossible it is to measure the influence of a good teacher by the hour standard, still, if we grant for the sake of argument, that we can do it, it will be found that the number of hours given to duty is already greater than that given by any other class of city employees. The nervous, worn-out state of many of our teachers at the close of the school year amply testifies to the truth of this statement.

Dr. Ternan of Leland Stanford University says, "Not even our superintendents and boards of education realize the terrible strain under which many teachers work."

As a result of tests on kinds of work in relation to mental strain, Wagner says, "From the standpoint of fatigue, one hour of teaching is equivalent to two hours of ordinary study. Four hours of teaching thus represent eight hours of ordinary mental work."

Dr. William Oldwright, Professor of Hygiene at the University of Toronto, points out that teaching is, in certain respects, one of the most hazardous of occupations. The percentage of persons who become tubercular is immensely higher than the percentage for the population as a whole. He says, also, what most of us in New York City know, that teachers are especially subject to pathological mental fatigue due to the great wear and tear resulting from the constant necessity for solving new situations. He says further that probably more than a million children in the United States are taught by persons who are neurasthenic, or otherwise nervously unstrung.

In connection with this last statement, the recent report of the United States Census Bureau at Washington is of immediate interest. In that report it is stated that, in hospitals for the insane, the number of inmates who come from cities is twice as great as is the number of those who come from rural districts. This fact has signification for us. It is fair to conclude that we in New York have already our full quota of the neurasthenic teachers mentioned by Dr. Oldwright without adding to the number by additional work.

Indeed, facts similar to the foregoing ought to teach us that the summer vacation is absolutely essential to the well-being of teachers. We should not willfully sow the wind in the form of compulsory vacation teaching unless we wish to reap the whirlwind in the number of absent sick teachers during the year that follows. Then, again, is it not retrogressive to attempt to increase months or hours, or days of labor for the teaching profession when the tendency everywhere in the working world today is towards shorter periods and more leisure?

Furthermore, is it morally wholesome for us to be forced so often to parallel our work with that of other departments of city employees? We are not working upon inert material. We are dealing with young life in all its promise. Whenever an inspiring address is made to teachers, emphasis is placed by the speaker on the professional spirit, on the high ideals that should control, on the preparation that is never complete, on the necessity for constant study in order that the teacher may keep pace with changes in method and in practise, and last, but not by any means least, on the joy that should be ours because of the opportunities for service in this great field of human endeavor.

Such are our ideals, yet it is sad to note that many seemingly devoted teachers now retired, manifest no interest, and retain no enthusiasm for the work of teaching. Instead, too frequently, utterance is given to cynical remarks about

the work, which indicate an inner temper that has been probably developed by irritating reflections on just such forms of injustice as we are discussing here this evening.

Is there not danger that a feeling of disgust very destructive of high professional ideals may be engendered when we reflect on the various attempts to deprecate, or belittle the work of education by the very persons who ought to be most cognizant of its value? Fine ideals may be made so impossible through stress of work that the city may not get the best service of even its ablest teachers. To-day, many excellent teachers put their energies into social movements outside of the school, because so much of the work of the school they believe to be undervalued. This is not true of other professions. A superannuated doctor or clergyman still retains his enthusiasm for the success of the ideals of his calling.

But let us consider the effect of this proposed measure on the success of the vacation school itself. The explanation most frequently offered for the present efficiency of vacation schools is that the work has been done by carefully selected teachers who are endowed with the missionary spirit, and who, therefore, are capable of inspiring backward and delinquent pupils. It has been said that the indifferent or irresponsible boy who has possibly developed a dislike for a given teacher through the school year, because of her nagging ways and adverse criticism, in the vacation schools, with these superior, great-hearted teachers, has been known to blossom out, revealing mental power never before suspected. How is it possible to maintain this high standard in the teaching force of those schools if we are now to have only the compulsory, unpaid service of already exhausted teachers? Work carried on in such a way must, of necessity, defeat its own ends.

And now a word not for delinquents, but for normal children. Should they never have any free days in their lives? Is education merely a question of extending indefinitely the hours and days spent

in the classroom, regardless of the stimulus at work upon pupils while there? Is there never to be any time when young people are to be allowed simply to grow; to have opportunity to be themselves, and to follow some of their own personal inclinations.

Perhaps, if we had less tendency in all schools to adhere to standards that we have outgrown socially and spiritually—standards that have been sent long since to the scrap heap by the world of industry and commerce—if we could get rid faster of obsolete matter and forms of instruction, possibly we would not find the children so woefully in need of vacation work.

Possibly the greatest evil of the whole situation, however, is a permanent loss of ethical ideals that must result from these attempts to foist upon the teachers a burden so far beyond the limits of their strength. Teachers are led to think that their interests, instead of being one with those of the city, are diametrically opposed to anything that sordid commercial interests, representing themselves as taxpayers, venture to suggest. Will teachers not also come to realize that their only hope of correcting injustice lies, not in discussion and in reasoning, but rather in such strength of organization that a united front will be maintained against even the most reasonable propositions submitted by a suspected, unfriendly class.

Whether or not the Corporation Counsel succeeds in interpreting the law so as to make it permissive to exact vacation teaching; whether or not we ignore the provision in the Constitution of the United States which prohibits involuntary servitude, we are fully cognizant of the moral grounds on which we make our plea. We know that jurisprudence rests on justice, however much a particular law may be misinterpreted or misapplied. We believe that it savors somewhat of a breach of faith to force us to render twelve months' service when custom and the present by-laws of the Board of Education have established a school year of ten months. There is no jug-

gling with the idea that salary is lowered, whether it be by actually lessening a given amount, or by exacting more work for the same money.

Then, again, can the city afford to have its teachers worried and harassed by such propositions? Do such discussions tend to promote peace and content in the schools? During the past four months, the bare possibility of such an injustice being perpetrated, has kept teachers in a state of unrest. Their attention has been dissipated, their energy sapped, and they have been unable to do efficiently the work which the city has employed them to do—namely, to teach the children.

Perhaps, in this connection, it may not be amiss to call attention to a report just made by the Commission on Industrial Relations at Washington. The commission states that one of the cardinal causes of industrial unrest is

"The rapidly growing feeling that redress for injuries and oppression cannot be secured through existing institutions." After a year's investigation covering all phases of the relations between capital and labor, the Commission puts this question: Is there need for changes, improvements, and adaptations, or must entirely new legal machinery be devised for the control of industry?

Is there not a probability that the teachers in their search for justice may begin to ask themselves, "Is it going to be necessary to devise entirely new legal machinery for the settlement of our problems, and for the accomplishment of our ideals, and if so, are we not strong enough to bring such changes about?"

Mrs. Ella Flagg Young, with her usual insight, says, "Real education is perpetual adjustment to the social movement." If this be true, how unfitted to train others are the teachers who, for lack of time, have no knowledge of the social movement. If every particle of strength they possess is exacted of them in the year's work, how can they keep themselves adjusted to the social movement? To keep ourselves in line with the educational thought of the twentieth century, we must have the leisure to come into close touch with other people's lives, and forms of work, so that we may correctly interpret the world in which we live. We shall thus come to realize the greatness of our opportunity as teachers, and be able to get the joy that we should out of our work. If we are to put our souls into the work of teaching, if we are to put the enthusiasm needed into the daily life of the school, we must resist all attempts to belittle in this fashion the importance of the work of education.

In our opposition to this measure, we feel sure that we have the sympathy of our Board of Education. We believe that the Board will give this proposition no support. We do not believe that our Board of Education which has declared its policy to be to invite the confidence of its teachers, to encourage a high professional spirit among them, and to capitalize in every way possible the teacher's experience, is at all likely to give sanction to a measure so pernicious, in its moral and professional aspects, as is this plan for compulsory, unpaid service in the vacation schools of the great, wealthy, and otherwise progressive City of New York.

## THE SIX-HOUR DAY\*

N ABRAHAM

Bryant High School, Long Island City, N Y

AMONG THE QUESTIONS offered for consideration in the annual report of President Churchill of 1913 was that of lengthening the official high school day to six hours. This would mean a daily

session from 8.40 or 9 a. m. to 3 p. m.

\* Part of Report of the Committee on School Organization and Management at meeting of Teachers' League of New York City, December 19, 1914.

instead of to 2.30 p. m., an addition of half an hour a day. For this additional half-hour, no additional compensation is suggested.

Upon the principle that an increase in the working time without any additional compensation is in reality a lowering of wages, the proposal should be opposed. In the course of a year, this extra half-hour per day, amounts to one hundred hours or the equivalent of four school weeks. We can realize the meaning of this without comparing the proposed year to a school year extending from August 15 to July 1, instead of from September 15 to July 1.

Then, again, we have to consider the viewpoint of teaching efficiency. Experience shows that the maximum number of hours for efficient teaching is four. The present official day is one of five hours, allowing for four hours of actual teaching and one hour of administrative work. As a matter of necessity, many teachers have to do more than four hours actual teaching a day, and efficiency is impaired in such cases. The proper course is not to demand of all the teaching force this extra work, but to relieve those already burdened by increasing the accommodations of the schools in question. The increase in time was suggested as a method of raising the efficiency of the high schools. We see that it may prove a means of making the schools less efficient.

Furthermore, there is a difference between the official school day and the actual working day of the teacher. The ringing of the gong at 2.30 o'clock does not mean that the teacher's school work has ceased. The time book and the time clock cards will show that the large majority of teachers continue work in school for hours after the official day has closed. A study of the facts will show that the actual teachers' working day is now nearer to ten hours than to six. Preparation for the day's teaching, checking up the work, improving oneself professionally, taking care of the school's and the student's outside and extra activities and welfare—these and more are work re-

quired or asked of every teacher in the system. The time for this work is not provided in the official school day. But the time is voluntarily given by the teacher. And in the course of each year enough extra time is given to make the average day of the high school teacher equal to at least nine hours. The proposed lengthening of the official school day does not provide for relieving the teacher of any part of the work he is doing at present, but merely adds another half hour to the burden.

That the high schools dismiss classes at 2.30 instead of at 3 as in the case of the elementary schools is chiefly due to the high schools having a shorter lunch period. The official teaching hours in the two kinds of schools are equal. The increase would make the high schools' day longer than the present elementary school day. Any favor shown to the suggestion on the ground that there is a difference between the official school time of the two kinds of schools is based on error.

From the standpoint of the pupil, the increase is also undesirable. Four hours of concentration is the maximum for efficient work. The same matters mentioned above from the standpoint of the teacher have equal force from the viewpoint of the pupils. More provision for recreation and study should be made for the pupils, but provision should not be made at the expense of the class teacher. The proper method to adopt is that of supplying special teachers with appropriate hours for special work.

The suggestion of lengthening the school day was made as one of the possible ways of increasing the efficiency of the high schools. It would have been better to have suggested that better use be made of the time already devoted to the official day. Better accommodations, less crowding of the curriculum, proper sized classes, better grading and classification of pupils, co-operative methods of administration—these are among the matters looked to for getting the greatest return out of the time spent in the official school day. Not more time but bet-

ter use of the time should be our answer to the President's suggestion.

On these grounds, then, namely, that it would be equivalent to a decrease in pay for the teacher; that it would tend to impair the efficiency of both teacher and pupil; that the remedy for school

troubles lies along other lines; and that the teacher's actual working day is already longer than it should be, this committee should express itself as opposed to the lengthening of the official school day in high schools.

## ECONOMICS OF ADDITIONAL SCHOOL WORK\*

MISS A L PARROTT  
P S 115, Manhattan, New York

TEACHING FOR twelve months for the same salary that we are now receiving for ten results in a reduction of the salary per month of  $\frac{1}{6}$ , or  $16\frac{2}{3}\%$ .

The salaries and conditions as at present fixed in New York City are failing to attract outsiders to such an extent that the board appointed a committee to discover why there were so few applicants from outside sources. It was recommended to the board of superintendents that they advertise for teachers in other cities and forward communications to the boards of education in other cities citing the inducements for coming to New York. All this has been done.

Circulars of the Board of Examiners under date of October 15, 1914, relating to the amount of credit given for outside experience have been altered during the past year to read: "Under the present schedule of allowance for outside experience, in the cases of graduates from approved normal schools or colleges, credit is usually given, year for year, up to eight years. Thus, such a graduate who has had eight years' successful experience elsewhere, would probably receive an initial salary of \$1,080 per annum." This is the salary at the beginning of the ninth year. Thus, in order to obtain a sufficient supply of teachers the board of superintendents has been obliged to allow outsiders the same salary, year for year, as those trained in the city schools, while formerly but five years was allowed for 9 years' outside experience, six for ten, and so on.

This circular also states: "The demand for grade teachers in the elementary schools of the City of New York is such that the eligible lists resulting from each of the examinations herein announced will probably be exhausted within eight months following the examination."

These lists would have been exhausted but for the consolidation of classes lately inaugurated to the great detriment of the schools. A comparison with Chicago will be illuminating:

In Chicago, schedules have lately been adopted providing for increases in 1916 and 1917. In 1917 they expect to provide, for the fifth and sixth grades, in the twelfth year, a maximum of \$1,500, the same maximum which we reach at the close of the fifteenth year, in corresponding grades. In Chicago, it is necessary to pass an examination, or obtain certain academic degrees, to entitle the teacher to pass from the first, second, third, or fourth grades, or so-called "Lower Group," to the fifth, sixth, or seventh grades, or so-called "Higher Group" of the elementary schools.

Having passed this additional requirement a teacher in the fifth or sixth grades of the Chicago schools would, by 1917, receive the \$1,500 maximum three years earlier than a teacher in the same grades in New York. Thus a New York teacher would receive \$360 less than a Chi-

\* Part of Report of the Committee on School Organization and Management at meeting of Teachers' League of New York City, December 19, 1914.

cago teacher during the same period of time. The fact that the cost of living is higher in New York than in Chicago must also be taken into consideration.

When these facts are considered—a reduction in the salary holds special significance, since the number of applicants from other sources is likely to decrease still further.

Thus, New York City, not being able to supply the demand entirely from its own resources, by adopting a course which would not be desirable in any event, would face a dearth of teachers.

Comparison with San Francisco and Denver, the latter, a city of but 200,000 inhabitants, reveals the following:

In the elementary grades, in Denver, the maximum of \$1,200 is reached at the beginning of the ninth year; in San Francisco, at the beginning of the eighth. In New York City the salary at the beginning of the ninth year is \$1,080.

At the beginning of the eleventh year, in New York, the salary is \$1,200, the

same period of time (ten months' actual teaching), teachers are receiving the same salary at the same year, \$1,200 per year, or \$120 per month.

Let New York City adopt a twelve-month school year, requiring the regular teachers to teach twelve months, for the same money for which they taught ten months, and the monthly salary becomes \$100 in New York, as compared with \$120 in these two smaller cities; and the salary for ten months' teaching in New York City becomes \$1,000, as compared with \$1,200, for ten months' teaching. In actual fact, the ratio would be even less favorable to New York.

It is needless to say that any increase in the hours per day, the days per week, or the weeks per year would result in the same relative reduction in the salary received and have the same tendency still further to produce a famine of desirable applicants for teachers' positions in the New York City schools.

### SIGNS OF PROGRESS

IN LOOKING over a list of bills recently introduced into Congress and the State legislature one cannot but be impressed with the unrest in the educational world. And in most cases it seems like well planned moves in advance. No less than five States have bills up for the medical examination of children and a number have bills on compulsory education and child labor. There is a steady movement toward consolidation of schools. Numerous States are attempting to induce a larger use of the school plant as a social center while some are extending the school term. Oregon moves for equal pay. New York and New Jersey are attempting to legislate the Bible into the schools while Connecticut would institute military instruction.

Vocational training is receiving considerable attention. In the lower house of Congress a comprehensive plan was presented whereby States were to receive

national aid for vocational training. Because of its apparent practicability there is danger of legislatures going astray upon this subject. Most educationists are themselves unprepared to attack this problem intelligently at the present time. Among those who have an understanding of the sociological bearings of the question are Ella Flagg Young, John Dewey, and W. C. Bagley. The aid of these should be sought in the formulation of bills upon vocational training.

The significant thing for the teaching profession is that there is a marked tendency to raise the standards of teaching. New York, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Ohio, Connecticut, South Dakota and Texas wish to make their normal school system more efficient. Higher standards will make for a better professional spirit, for initiative on the part of the teacher, and hence will tend to break down our present servile attitude towards authority.

# American Teacher

*Democracy in Education : Education for Democracy*

Published monthly, except July and August, by  
THE AMERICAN TEACHER COMPANY, INC.,  
129 Lafayette Street, New York.

ANGELO PATERL.....President  
LOUISE M. DITHRIDGE.....Treasurer

EDITED BY

HENRY R. LINVILLE.....Editor-in-Chief  
BENJAMIN C. GRUENBERG.....Managing Editor

JULIA H. DOYLE JAY D. LESTER  
MARK HOFFMAN JOSEPH LOEW  
CHARLOTTE E. LEE GABRIEL R. MASON  
J. EDWARD MAYMAN.....Business Manager

This Magazine will be sent to subscribers until  
an order to discontinue, together with all arrears,  
is received. At the time of expiration, a bill will be  
found in the copy.

REMITTANCES should be made in postal money-  
order, express order, draft, stamps or check (New  
York exchange).

Subscription price, 50 cents for the year.  
(Foreign, 60 cents)



Entered at the Post Office of New York  
as second-class matter.

VOL. IV APRIL, 1915 No. 4

This paper is striving to do its part  
in the creation of a real profession of  
teaching, the members of which shall  
be self-respecting and respected, thru  
stimulating clear thinking on the work  
and the social position of teachers, and  
thru intelligent criticism of systems of  
educational administration. No greater  
service than this could be rendered to  
the children of the state.

## FOR CLEANER LEADERSHIP

ONE IS NEVER remembered as a welcome guest who says, "No, thank you, we have celery at home, and I think it's cleaner." In the same way, we are inclined to resent the remarks of those teachers who were brot up "in the country," when they say, "In Massachusetts the type of professional leader of your Mr Blinks or your Miss Swinks would be absolutely impossible. Their methods

and their ideals appear to me to be characteristic of political wire-pullers. When I came to New York, drawn by your more favorable tenure of position regulations, I was greatly shocked to find that skill in teaching, or the possession of educational or social ideals and ability to work for them, bore little if any relation to leadership among the teachers." It is easy enough to settle the case of the personal guest; we simply don't invite him again. But the City's guest came uninvited. He is now one of us, and we cannot really quit even by telling him to go back to Massachusetts.

But the gentlemen from Massachusetts or elsewhere does not represent the only group that complains of the low character of professional leadership among the teachers of New York City. Insiders also complain. Municipal officials complain, and blame the teacher-leaders for the increased taxation to meet the demands of legislation past despite the City's protest. Members of the Board of Education complain, unless they can use the power of the leaders to further their own ends. Superintendents and principals complain, and take it out of the teachers. The teachers themselves complain—and join with one teacher-politician to fight another.

Few of the protesters from the inside, however, have the point of view of the gentleman from Massachusetts. They do not see what they are missing. Most of the emphasis of the aggressive persons connected directly or indirectly with educational leadership is on fight, fight, fight. Sometimes we do hear about cooperation, but coöperation is useful to those who want to fight harder. The leaders themselves do not see what they are missing. They only know that "if you want anything in New York, you must have the right sort of backing, and then you must hang on and fight."

It is more or less useless to try to make the teacher-politicians see what they are missing, altho some of them, possibly most of them, would have been ideal leaders, if better ideals than those that were known to lead to success had been

presented to their minds at the beginning of their careers. It is also useless to try to put them out of the leadership by preventing their participation in proposed democratic administration, as was suggested by Superintendent Elliott in the School Inquiry Report on the New York school system.

As soon as the intelligent portion of the general public, under the leadership of the idealists in the ranks of the teaching profession, comes to know that it cannot bring to realization the urgent social and economic needs in education until the great body of teachers are working under the stimulus of social ideals, then the necessity of a cleaner, more ideal leadership than now prevails in the profession will also be apparent. The public may have its curricula of domestic science, vocational guidance, industrial education, and whatever else it wants, but so long as the development and the control of all these social forces are in the hands of the persons "who have the right backing," so long will the heart of the rank and file not be in the work, if, indeed, the heart does not go out of the profession altogether.

---

### HOW IT FEELS TO BE SUP- PRESSED

WITHIN THE past month, an editor of THE AMERICAN TEACHER has been informed that a principal of an elementary school in New York City recently charged his teachers not to support this paper. We leave the "his" in the sentence without marks of quotation, for the pronoun has technical significance, and applies widely. That fact adds to the difficulty of our determining the identity of the principal, as our friend who gave the information preferred not to go so far as to tell us the principal's name. The difficulty is still further increased by the fact that there are several schools in the City where our subscriptions are characterized by extreme scantiness. We are unable to say whether the prevalence of scantiness means suppression, or subjection, or both—whether suppression of the

paper, or subjection of the teachers, or both.

For some time we have known that the principal of a Brooklyn high school intimated to *his* teachers in teachers' meeting on one occasion that he took it for granted that THE AMERICAN TEACHER would receive no support from the teachers of that school, since the school had been criticised unfavorably by the paper. There was no doubt expressed then, and at no time has there come to the paper any denial, of the accuracy of the criticism.

We may be pardoned for betraying indications of elation, for, after suffering three years of indifference on the part of nearly all the members of the Board of Education, the superintendents, the principals, and most of the teachers of the Great City, it feels good to have the standpatters show signs of life. We are encouraged to double our efforts.

Next to thankfulness for real cash subscriptions, of which we are sadly in need, we shall be glad to display gratitude for information on the attitude of educational officers who disapprove our policy of educational regeneration so fiercely that they are willing to talk about it in their official capacity.

---

IN ANOTHER column of this issue is given an interview with the president of The Teachers' Council of The City of New York. The dearth of the information gathered by the reporter is interesting and instructive. Sometime, let us hope, there will be formed in this city, an association devoted to the "Principles of Democracy." Under its sheltering wing will develop a hopeful, helpful, cheerful, truthful body of teachers whose influence will be a force for positive good to their pupils, their fellow-workers, their superiors, and to humanity in general.

The existence of a private business college in a city is an indication of the fact that several young people in that community do not approve of the high school, and also of the fact that said high school is not living up to its opportunity.—*The Educator-Journal*, November, 1914.

### A PAID BOARD

THE BEST ARGUMENT we have so far met for a paid board of education was advanced by Mr Raymond Fosdick, formerly Commissioner of Accounts of New York City, investigator of police administration in European cities, and now a member of the Board of Education. At a recent meeting of the board, in a discussion on the rights of teachers and other officials to take an active part in the business of being citizens, Mr Fosdick referred to the various employes of the Department of Education in a tone of voice which the newspapers did not reproduce, but in a phrase that carried to many people an insolent implication of inferiority or subservience. He spoke of them as "our paid subordinates."

We do not suppose that Mr Fosdick intended his remarks as an argument for a paid board. And we are assured, thru a letter to a newspaper written by one of his former "paid subordinates," that Mr Fosdick is thoroly democratic in his outlook and sympathies, and that he is not at all a snob. It is nevertheless a fact that the early-Victorian traditions which still linger in our midst force upon us a certain disdain toward those who are "paid" for their work; and if we happen to be working for pay ourselves, these traditions force upon us a certain air of apology. Now these traditions of the respectability of affluent idleness, and of the concomitant igominy of penurious industry, are obviously incompatible with the ideals of a democracy in which most people are both willing to work and dependent upon wages for their livelihood. In such a democracy we cannot depend for our public policy upon those who scorn labor. Those who have no sympathy with the worker's wage. Those who consider themselves superior *because* they do not have to work—or rather, those who consider you and me inferior *because* we cannot afford to work without pay—cannot be trusted to look after the interests of common folks, except in the way of kind patrons; and in a democracy the public does not want to be the object of private patronage—kind or otherwise.

In the government of England—a government of landowners—it never occurred to any one to pay the members of Parliament. Legislating has always been gentlemen's work—the work of people who have others to do the real work for them. But when ordinary folks managed to break into the House of Commons thru the votes of other ordinary folks, it became necessary to establish a scale of pay for the public's representatives. And only then did it become possible for the members of Parliament to represent the public, and not merely the privileged classes. In this country we shall have to meet the same problem at a hundred points.

If a board of education is to represent the people, it will have to be made up of men and women who cannot afford to neglect their private business in the service of the public. There are many men in every city who would be available for mayor if there was no salary attached to the office. The honor is compensation enough. But that would restrict our choice of mayor to men of leisure and wealth, and we feel that that would not be quite satisfactory. To be sure, it may be that it is only among those who have leisure and wealth that suitable men can be found; but we do not like to be confined in our choice by such obviously irrelevant circumstances. Of course we recognize that the mayor's salary is in no sense paid for services rendered; you cannot measure the value of a mayor's services in dollars and cents—and you pay all your mayors the same amount. The salary is merely a provision for insuring the incumbent and his family a decent maintainance during the period of service.

The same principle should apply to the salaries of all public servants; and sooner or later we shall have to apply it to members of the Board of Education. Otherwise we may not escape from the intolerable snobbery that the rich and idle invariably throw at their "paid subordinates." Then we shall have a chance to work with "paid co-ordinates," and there will be no sting in the "pay."

### IMPUDENT CLAIMS?

RECENTLY A NUMBER of teachers appeared before the New York State Legislature to express their sentiments on the proposed bill to form a small board of education in New York. Several newspapers commented on this action. One paper characterized it as "an impudent teachers' lobby," and stated that "it is none of the principals' or teachers' business whether the size of the board is decreased or increased. Their place is in their offices or classrooms." Another paper, less reactionary, made the answer that the teachers had relinquished none of the rights of ordinary citizens, and that they were quite within their rights as citizens in expressing their views before the Legislature.

From time to time, we read in the papers that this or that group of persons has sent some of their number to Albany to argue for or against some bill which affects their interests. Why do we not hear of an impudent merchants' or physicians' lobby?

Members of the medical profession serve their interests in the same way. On page 118 of the March number of the *New York State Journal of Medicine*, we read the following:

"The Committee on Legislation, as directed by the Council, begs to inform the profession that it entered a vigorous protest against the enactment into law of the Tallett Bill, etc."

And again, "The profession is also asked by the Council and the Committee on Legislation to oppose Senate Bills No 733, etc, etc."

As a matter of fact, physicians as well as merchants make it a part of their business to watch legislation. One of the standing committees of the county medical societies is the committee on legislation. This is one of the activities which we expect of our medical societies. And the medical profession apologizes to no one for taking an interest in legislation which concerns the interests of the profession or which may have an influence on public health.

Members of other professions, trades or businesses may endorse or oppose proposed legislation. But the teacher's place is in the classroom. Why? Is it because there is a halo over the classroom, or is it because of the slight respect in which the teaching profession is held?

Teachers have begun to see that the larger matters of education do concern them. They are tired of being merely "intellectual hired help," whose only function is to obey orders blindly. Progress never goes backward. Consequently we may expect, in the nature of things, that teachers will become more and more alive to matters of general public interest, and especially to those which concern education in all its phases.

---

NOW, HOWEVER, as a hundred years ago, the only proof of true liberalism is being able to liberate one's self from the prejudices peculiar to *one's own time*—not from those of another age.—ELLEN KEY, in *The Younger Generation*.

### CO-OPERATION

Of all great human enterprises, that of education demands the highest degree of co-operation; our schools cannot be governed by a regime and form of machinery borrowed from the army; they cannot be governed by a form of government adapted from the church; they cannot be governed and regulated by a form of machinery for governing the great industrial corporations; they can only be governed as any great co-operative enterprise can be governed and that is by the recognition of the essential principles of democracy. Democracy is something more than mere words, and whereas, we in America have preached the doctrine of democracy we have not yet reached the point where we have been willing to practice the ideal of democracy for children and for teachers.—PROF E C ELLIOTT, in Address before the League of Teachers' Associations.

# The Effect of Increasing the Amount of Teaching on the Efficiency of the Teachers\*

ELIZABETH M. TOMPKINS  
Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn

THE IMPORTANCE of maintaining the highest efficiency of the teaching force is a consideration that is constantly overlooked. One hears, "the welfare of the school, not of the teachers, is the important thing." Such a statement is absurd. The teachers are the school. The school is a factory, the pupils are the raw material as they enter, the finished product—good citizens we hope—as they leave, and like all material that passes through a factory, constantly changing. They, surely, are not the school as a permanent institution. The one thing that is permanent is the machinery, that is, the teaching force. This is the school. The efficiency of the school is the efficiency of this machinery. The wise course is to get the most out of the machinery that is available. Can the school day or the school year be lengthened without affecting the condition of the teachers so as to lower their efficiency and therefore make the work of the schools of a poorer quality?

The human mechanism is most complex and delicate by nature, capable of wonderful work but easily thrown out of order by unfavorable conditions and overstrain. It can do the best work only when in the best condition. Think of the intensity of the work of the teacher of boys and girls. Is it not easy to see why a great amount of it would be an unendurable strain to so delicate a machine? Every teacher knows the difference between the work he does when fresh and vigorous and when tired or ill. We can do much better work the first period than the sixth and very poor work indeed after 2:30. Try as hard as we may, we are not as efficient in June as we are in September.

These machines of ours, being organisms are capable of self-repair and readjustment, but they must have the right conditions for this. One condi-

tion is rest. It is evident that the harder the work the longer must be the rest period. The work of the teacher is intensely difficult; the rest period must be long. If, as seems to be the case with the present length of school day and school year, the time for rest is scarcely long enough for restoring to the normal efficiency the majority of teachers, it is apparent that a lengthened day or a lengthened year with no way to increase the rest period could not fail to result in great loss of efficiency of the school, and therefore a loss in education.

But repair alone is not sufficient. Besides maintaining good health there must be a growth of the spirit. For this there must be new ideas, a new outlook upon life, new inspiration—the things that reading, travel, university study, associations with new people, communion with nature, give. Where during the school year from September to July does the teacher get time for these things? The majority of teachers put all their time for six, and sometimes seven, days a week on their work and the rest which it requires.

The relation of the physical condition of the worker to his efficiency is a fact that is recognized by most manufacturing concerns. Large expenditures for improving the conditions under which the employees work are considered well made since the return in increased efficiency is large. In education, that most important of all industries, this relation seems to be rather overlooked, in spite of the fact that efficiency is the thing that most affects the education of the child.

The efficiency of the school is the

---

\* Part of Report of the Committee on School Organization and Management at meeting of Teachers' League of New York City, December 19, 1914.

efficiency of its teachers. A lengthened school day or a lengthened school year make conditions unfavorable to maintaining health and increasing spiritual vigor and would, therefore, result in the lessening of the efficiency of the teaching force; that is, in making the work of the school of poorer quality.

### RIGHTS VERSUS FAVORS

(From an interview by HENRIETTA RODMAN in *The New York Tribune*, February 3, 1915.)

**MR MAGNUS GROSS**, president of the Teachers' Council, says members of the council are free to make any suggestions to the Board of Education that they please.

"Has the Teachers' Council ever opposed any established policy of the Board of Education?" Mr Gross was asked.

"I do not recall any such action," he replied, "but I am sure that the board would receive any suggestion from the council without prejudice. The Teachers' Council has, however, come into conflict with the Board of Superintendents. Superintendent Maxwell has stated publicly that he objected to seeking the advice of teachers."

"Has the Teachers' Council ever asked that the teachers be given more responsibility for the subjects taught and for the discipline of the schools?" I asked.

"I do not know that they have."

"Perhaps they don't want more responsibility or democracy?" I suggested.

"Perhaps they don't," he agreed. "But you must remember that the teachers are human and that promotion depends on the favor of their superiors. Very few teachers are willing to risk their future for the sake of expressing their opinions."

"Of course, if the schools were differently organized the teachers might speak more freely. Under present conditions we can't expect them to say anything that might jeopardize their chances of promotion."

Teachers elect delegates to the council by organizations. There are forty-five accredited organizations. If a teacher does

not belong to one of these she has no vote. If she belongs to several organizations she may vote several times.

Mr Gross explained:

"A principal is at the head of each school. He is responsible for it, and he naturally wishes to control his school as far as possible. He would probably wish to influence the election of delegates. It was to free the teachers from this influence that the elections were placed in the hands of organizations outside of the schools."

"Aren't the school councils (organizations of teachers within the schools) sufficiently independent to represent the teachers even against the principal?" I asked.

"These councils are made up of individual teachers, each of whom is dependent on the favor of his principal," Mr Gross smiled. "The charter would have to be changed to give the teachers self-government," he said.

"Why doesn't the teachers' council ask for such a change?" I asked. Mr Gross smiled again, and the interview ended.

### GOOD OUTLOOK

One of the far-reaching movements of the past year was the reorganization of the system for the employment and promotion of teachers and fixing their salaries. The new schedule, which classifies teachers according to experience, preparation and success, rather than experience alone, is having the effect of arousing teachers to the necessity of making professional preparation for responsible work they have to do. Never before in the history of the schools have so many teachers attended summer schools, colleges and universities. More teachers' periodicals are being read than ever before, and teachers are taking advantage of every opportunity to improve themselves in the technique of their profession.—Superintendent James H. Risley, Owensboro, Ky., in his report for 1912-13.

## BOOK NOTES

**THE DRAMATIC INSTINCT IN EDUCATION.** By ELINORA WHITMAN CURTIS, Ph.D. With a Foreword By G. STANLEY HALL. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co. \$1 net.

"BURGLARIZING and trainwrecking on the part of small boys is nothing more nor less than the dramatic instinct gone wrong." Whether we agree with this extreme dictum or not, is of little consequence. Of one thing we feel certain and that is, that there is a dramatic instinct in children. And it is the business of teachers to direct this instinct into proper channels. The "desiccating effect of our education on the emotional life of our children" has become almost proverbial with us. How can our education be made more dynamic, more fitted to the child's instincts? This is the big problem. A secondary but no less important problem is, What use can we make of the dramatic instinct in the education of children?

Miss Curtis's book comes at the moment when all thoughtful teachers are seeking for light on this subject. After a foreword by G. Stanley Hall (who wishes that he had written the book himself) the author takes up the following topics: The theater going of children; Psychological aspects of dramatic entertainment; Dramatic work in schools and colleges; Constructive efforts to provide good drama; Play; Dancing; Story-telling; Moving-pictures; Marionette or Puppet-play; Pageantry.

It can be seen from this that the book is not a profound psychological study of the dramatic instinct in children. While the psychological basis is not neglected or minimized, the purpose of the book seems to be first, to call the attention of educators and the public to the necessity of regulating the active and passive dramatic manifestations in child life and second, to disseminate information on what has already been done in progressive school communities in the direction of applying the dramatic idea to all school activities. For instance, in Charlottenberg, Germany, two plays are given yearly to twelve hundred pupils and the cost is included in the annual school budget. In Berlin

for many years past twelve thousand pupils have each year attended plays, the cost of which is met either by royal subsidy or private contribution. It should be noted here that teachers' associations in Germany have been largely influential in furthering this work. The author also supplies us with very valuable data as to what has been done in our own country and in our own city.

This book is not a special treatise for teachers of dramatics. It should be in the hands of every teacher who influences or hopes to influence children. That the moral and social motive dominates the purpose of the author can be clearly perceived in the closing paragraph of the book. "Have we not a right to expect to see its (the development of the dramatic instinct) effects in the next generation in a better sense of law and order, a finer, more disinterested type of public service? Surely the function of the school is not only to utilize the dramatic instinct in the curriculum, but, by means of it, to train the faculty of criticism and appreciation, so as to produce a reaction against *all* degenerate tastes, and to work toward the general uplifting of public morals."

---

A helpful study in social pathology that should be of special interest to teachers is *Safeguards for City Youth at Work and at Play*, by Louise de Koven Bowen, the President of the Juvenile Protective Association of Chicago. The concrete illustrations of the many dangers to which children are exposed in the streets, stores, shops and recreation places of various kinds are drawn from Chicago; but the dangers described and the methods of preventing the demoralization and destruction of youth apply to all of our cities. The close relation that should exist between the various agencies that have to do with child welfare is vividly brot before us by the accounts of past achievements and present needs. (The Macmillan Co., \$1.50 net.)

---

In union there is strength. Unite with other teachers to make the movement for democracy in education a success. Send postal orders or stamps; everything helps.

# The City and the Worker

A noteworthy attempt to formulate the ideals that should govern the relations between the community and its paid employes appears in the weekly bulletin of the Philadelphia Bureau of Municipal Research, *Citizens' Business*, for March 11. It takes the form of a "Contract" and is based on the postulate "If the city fulfills its obligations as an employer it can expect more efficient service from its employes." One may not accept all the definitions and implications in this proposed "Contract," but we can all afford to give some thought to the problems it attempts to meet.

## A CONTRACT

**THIS AGREEMENT**, made at the opening of a new era in municipal employment between the City of Philadelphia and its employes, present and prospective, witnesseth:

That the City of Philadelphia in consideration of faithful and efficient service to be rendered by its employes agrees

1. To reward every man and woman in its service with just remuneration—to allow neither favoritism nor partisan considerations to influence its dealings with its workers, and to be guided solely by the actual duties and responsibilities of each individual in determining his compensation.
2. To insure permanency of employment to all persons who have joined its ranks, and to demand of those officials who hold temporarily the high places in its government that they respect the tenure of subordinates who have entered the service with the hope of earning a permanent livelihood and of working out a life career.
3. To afford to each employe an opportunity to rise in the service in accordance with demonstrated merit and capacity to perform more responsible duties, and to disregard all other considerations in advancing individuals to higher places.
4. To make employment in its service a mark of distinction, by insisting upon standards of efficiency and integrity which not only will compare favorably with those of private establishments, but will set the pace for employments in the commercial world.
5. To hold out a future to all who enter its employ—to offer opportunities for the

exercise of the highest faculties of body, mind and spirit; to make possible a career comparable in dignity and achievement with any that awaits the capable and the ambitious in fields of private enterprise, and to insure such recompense in material well-being and popular esteem as the loyal service of a lifetime deserves.

Each employe on his part agrees

1. To be efficient—to apply all his thought and energy to the tasks before him, to be accurate and thorough in all his work, and in addition to mastering his own duties to prepare himself for those of more responsible places which he may be called upon to fill.
2. To be loyal—to work in harmony with the plans and purposes of his superiors, and to submerge personal preferences to the interests of public welfare.
3. To be trustworthy—to be fair and impartial in all his dealings with individual citizens; to be true to his obligations as a custodian of public property; and to be vigilant and courageous as a defender of the people's rights and interests against all attempts to defraud, deceive, or exploit.
4. To be socially-minded—to recognize in the city government a co-operative community effort directed toward social ends, to be animated by a genuine desire to serve in the cause of community welfare and social betterment, and to be imbued with a firm faith in the ultimate realization of civic ideals.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the City of Philadelphia and each employe in its service from this day forth do act in accordance herewith.

---

**Help yourself by helping us make The American Teacher a more helpful magazine. Every new subscription helps**